

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 RICHARD LEE JOHNSEN,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 HENRY TAMBE,

12 Defendant.

Case No. C19-141 TSZ-MLP

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

13
14 This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 prisoner civil rights action. This matter comes before the
15 Court on Plaintiff's motion seeking reconsideration of this Court's April 5, 2019 Order Denying
16 Plaintiff's Motion for Default. (Dkt. # 21.) Plaintiff asserts that he did not personally receive
17 timely notification that Defendant had returned the Waiver of Service of Summons by the
18 applicable deadline, and the undersigned's Order mistakenly states that "Plaintiff argues the
19 deadline for Defendant to return the waiver was March 17, 2019." (Dkt. # 19.) However,
20 Plaintiff no longer argues that Defendant failed to timely return the Waiver to the Court by
21 March 27, 2019, and simply asks that the Court send him a copy of the Waiver of Service and
22 Notice of Appearance from the Court for his records. (Dkt. # 21.)
23

1 The Court will ordinarily deny motions for reconsideration “in the absence of a showing
2 of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
3 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). Although
4 Plaintiff is correct that the Court’s prior Order contains a typographical error stating that Plaintiff
5 identified the deadline as March 17, 2019, when in fact he identified the deadline as March 27,
6 2019, this error was inconsequential to the Court’s analysis relating to Plaintiff’s Motion for
7 Default. It is undisputed that the deadline for the Defendant to return the Waiver of Service was
8 March 27, 2019, and that it was properly filed with the Court by that date. (Dkt. # 16.) In sum,
9 Plaintiff has not demonstrated manifest error in the Court’s prior ruling, or any new facts or legal
10 authority which change the outcome of the Court’s ruling on his Motion for Default. Plaintiff’s
11 motion for reconsideration (dkt. # 21) is therefore DENIED.

12 The Clerk is directed to send copies of this order to the parties and to the Honorable
13 Thomas S. Zilly. The Clerk is further directed to mail copies of the Waiver of Service and Notice
14 of Appearance (dkt. ## 14-16) to Plaintiff.

15 Dated this 18th day of April, 2019.

16 

17 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
18 United States Magistrate Judge
19
20
21
22
23